UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/684,528	10/15/2003	Abdus Suttar Khan	033275-412	4090

21839 7590 02/06/2006

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC
(INCLUDING BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS)
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER	
WONG, EDNA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1753	

DATE MAILED: 02/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/684,528	KHAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Edna Wong	1753	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *See "Other"*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☒ Other: *See Continuation Sheet*.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 6). Other: October 15, 2003 and Febraury 12, 2004.

Specification

I. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the number "0,5" in line 8 should be amended to the number -- 0.5 --. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

II. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

page 1, line 12, "claim 1" should be deleted because it is improper for the specification to refer to the claims.

page 4, lines 30-31, "claim 1 or 2" should be deleted because it is improper for the specification to refer to the claims.

Appropriate correction is required.

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

Claims **1 and 2** are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1

line 3, the word -- and -- should be inserted after the element "Y,".

line 3, the word "Rest" should be amended to the word -- balance --.

line 4, the word -- on the surface of the article -- should be inserted after the word "process".

Claim 2

line 2, the word -- and -- should be inserted after the element "Y,".

line 3, the word "Rest" should be amended to the word -- balance --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims **1-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1

line 1, the definition of "M" in "MCrAlY" is missing in the claim.

lines 2-3, "the MCrAlY-coating which comprises (wt.-%) 21-25% Co, 16-20% Cr, 8-12% Al, 0.01-0.5% Y, Rest Ni" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 2

line 1, it appears that "a layer" is the same as the layer of the MCrAlY-coating recited in claim 1, lines 2-3. However, it is unclear if it is.

If it is, then it is suggested that the word "a" should be amended to the word -- the --.

lines 2-3, "the MCrAlY-coating which comprises (wt.-%) 23% Co, 18% Cr, 10% Al, 0.5% Y, Rest Ni" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 3

lines 1-2, it appears that "a layer" is the same as the layer of the MCrAlY-coating recited in claim 1, lines 2-3. However, it is unclear if it is.

If it is, then it is suggested that the word "a" should be amended to the word -- the --.

If it is not, then the MCrAlY-coating comprises two layers (= the MCrAlY-coating which comprises (wt.-%) 21-25% Co, 16-20% Cr, 8-12% Al, 0.01-0.5% Y, Rest Ni *and* the MCrAlY-coating having a γ/β-microstructure) deposited by two different processes.

line 2, "the MCrAlY-coating having a γ/β-microstructure" lacks antecedent basis.

line 2, it appears that the "deposited" is the same as the deposited by an electroplating process recited in claim 1, lines 3-4. However, it is unclear if it is.

Claim 4

lines 1-2, "the deposited coating" lacks antecedent basis. The word "coating" should be amended to the word -- layer --.

Claim 5

line 2, it appears that "a layer" is the same as the layer of the MCrAlY-coating recited in claim 1, lines 2-3. However, it is unclear if it is.

If it is, then it is suggested that the word "a" should be amended to the word -- the --.

If it is not, then the MCrAlY-coating comprises two layers (= the MCrAlY-coating which comprises (wt.-%) 21-25% Co, 16-20% Cr, 8-12% Al, 0.01-0.5% Y, Rest Ni *and* the MCrAlY-coating comprising in addition (wt.-%) 0.01 to 3% Fe) deposited by two different processes.

lines 2-3, "the MCrAlY-coating comprising in addition (wt.-%) 0.01 to 3% Fe" lacks antecedent basis.

line 3, it appears that the "deposited" is the same as the deposited by an electroplating process recited in claim 1, lines 3-4. However, it is unclear if it is.

Claim 6

lines 1-2, it appears that "a layer" is the same as the layer of the MCrAlY-coating recited in claim 1, lines 2-3. However, it is unclear if it is.

If it is, then it is suggested that the word "a" should be amended to the word -- the --.

If it is not, then the MCrAlY-coating comprises two layers (= the MCrAlY-coating which comprises (wt.-%) 21-25% Co, 16-20% Cr, 8-12% Al, 0.01-0.5% Y, Rest Ni *and* the MCrAlY-coating comprising in addition (wt.-%) 0.5-2.5% Si, 0-1.5% Hf, 0.01-0.2% Zr either alone or in combination) deposited by two different processes.

lines 2-3, "the MCrAlY-coating comprising in addition (wt.-%) 0.5-2.5% Si, 0-1.5% Hf, 0.01-0.2% Zr either alone or in combination" lacks antecedent basis.

line 3, it appears that the "deposited" is the same as the deposited by an electroplating process recited in claim 1, lines 3-4. However, it is unclear if it is.

Claim 7

lines 1-2, it appears that "a layer" is the same as the layer of the MCrAlY-

coating recited in claim 1, lines 2-3. However, it is unclear if it is.

If it is, then it is suggested that the word "a" should be amended to the word -- the --.

If it is not, then the MCrAlY-coating comprises two layers (= the MCrAlY-coating which comprises (wt.-%) 21-25% Co, 16-20% Cr, 8-12% Al, 0.01-0.5% Y, Rest Ni *and* the MCrAlY-coating comprising in addition (wt.-%) 0-2% Ta) deposited by two different processes.

Furthermore, if 0% Ta is added, then how is this layer different from the MCrAlY-coating recited in claim 1, lines 2-3?

lines 2-3, "the MCrAlY-coating comprising in addition (wt.-%) 0-2% Ta" lacks antecedent basis.

line 3, it appears that the "deposited" is the same as the deposited by an electroplating process recited in claim 1, lines 3-4. However, it is unclear if it is.

Claim 8

lines 1-2, it appears that "a layer" is the same as the layer of the MCrAlY-coating recited in claim 1, lines 2-3. However, it is unclear if it is.

line 2, it appears that the "deposited" is the same as the deposited by an electroplating process recited in claim 1, lines 3-4. However, it is unclear if it is.

line 3, it is unclear which deposited layer "the deposited layer" is further limiting - is it the MCrAlY-coating which comprises (wt.-%) 21-25% Co, 16-20% Cr, 8-12% Al, 0.01-0.5% Y, Rest Ni (from claim 1, lines 2-3) *or* the layer of the MCrAlY-coating deposited with a thickness control of ±20 μm (from claim 8, lines 1-2)?

Claim 9

line 1, it appears the "a layer" is the same as the MCrAlY-coating which comprises (wt.-%) 21-25% Co, 16-20% Cr, 8-12% Al, 0.01-0.5% Y, Rest Ni (from claim 1, lines 2-3) *or* the layer of the MCrAlY-coating comprising in addition (wt.-%) 0-2% Ta (from claim 7, line 2). However, it is unclear if it is.

If it is not, then the MCrAlY-coating comprises three layers deposited by three different processes.

line 2, "the MCrAlY-coating having a thickness in the range of 25-400 μm" lacks antecedent basis.

line 2, it is unclear which deposited the "deposited" is further limiting - is it the deposited by an electroplated process (from claim 1, lines 3-4) *or* the deposited (from claim 7, line 2)?

Claim 10

line 1, it appears the "a layer" is the same as the MCrAlY-coating which comprises (wt.-%) 21-25% Co, 16-20% Cr, 8-12% Al, 0.01-0.5% Y, Rest Ni (from claim 1, lines 2-3) *or* the MCrAlY-coating is deposited with a thickness control of ±20 μm (from claim 8, line 2). However, it is unclear if it is.

If it is not, then the MCrAlY-coating comprises three layers deposited by three different processes.

line 2, "the MCrAlY-coating having a thickness in the range of 25-300 μm" lacks antecedent basis.

line 2, it is unclear which deposited the "deposited "is further limiting - is it the deposited by an electroplated process (from claim 1, lines 3-4) *or* the deposited (from claim 8, line 2)?

Claim 11

line 1, it appears the "a layer" is the same as the layer recited in claim 1, lines 2-3; claim 7, lines 1-2; or claim 9, lines 1-2. However, it is unclear if it is.

If it is not, then the MCrAlY-coating comprises four layers deposited by four different processes.

line 2, "the MCrAlY-coating having a thickness in the range of 25-100 μm"

lacks antecedent basis.

line 2, it is unclear which deposited the "deposited "is further limiting - is it the deposited by an electroplated process (from claim 1, lines 3-4); the deposited (from claim 7, line 2), *or* the deposited (from claim 9, line 2)?

Claim 12

line 1, it appears the "a layer" is the same as the layer recited in claim 1, lines 2-3; claim 8, line 2; or claim 10, lines 1-2. However, it is unclear if it is.

If it is not, then the MCrAlY-coating comprises four layers deposited by four different processes.

line 2, "the MCrAlY-coating having a thickness in the range of 25-50 μm" lacks antecedent basis.

line 2, it is unclear which deposited the "deposited "is further limiting - is it the deposited by an electroplated process (from claim 1, lines 3-4); the deposited (from claim 8, line 2, *or* the deposited (from claim 10, line 2)?

Claim 13

line 2, it appears the "a layer" is the same as the layer recited in claim 1, lines 2-3. However, it is unclear if it is.

line 2, it appears that the "deposited" is the same as the deposited by an electroplating process recited in claim 1, lines 3-4. However, it is unclear if it is.

Claim 14

line 2, it appears that "a gas turbine article" is further limiting the article recited in claim 1, line 2. However, it is unclear if it is.

line 2, the phrase "such as blades or vanes" is indefinite.

line 2, it appears that "coated" is the same as deposited recited in claim 1, lines 3-4. However, it is unclear if it is.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or

patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims **1-14** are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of copending Application No. 10/726,593 (Khan et al.). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows:

Depositing a MCrAlY coating on the surface of an article by an electroplating process.

The claims of the instant application fail to be patentably distinct from the claims of the copending application because the independent claims of the instant application recites similar limitations, either alone or in combination with their dependent claims, as that of the claims of the copending application, wherein the claims of the instant application are encompassed by the claims of the copending application. The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application. Therefore, the claims would have been obvious variants over each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims **1-2, 6-7 and 13-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over **EP 848 077** ('077).

EP '077 teaches a method of depositing a layer of a MCrAlY-coating on the surface of an article (= gas turbine engine) [page 2, lines 3-5; and page 3, lines 13-28], wherein the layer of the MCrAlY-coating which comprises (wt.-%):

(a) 21-25% Co (= 23 wt%);

(b) 16-20% Cr (10-25 wt%);

(c) 8-12% Al (= 5-15 wt%);

(d) 0.01-0.5% Y (0.1-1.0 wt%); and

(e) balance Ni (= balance Ni) [page 3, lines 34-48; and Table II)

is deposited by an electroplated process (page 3, line 36-37).

The layer of the MCrAlY-coating comprises (wt.-%) 23% Co (= 23 wt% Co), 18% Cr (= 18 wt% Cr), 10% Al (= 12.5 wt% Al), 0.5% Y (= 0.3 wt% Y), Rest Ni (= balance Ni) (page 3, line 34-48, esp., Table II).

The layer of the MCrAlY-coating further comprises (wt.-%) 0.5-2.5% Si (= up to 1 wt%), 0-1.5% Hf (= up to 5 wt%), 0.01-0.2% Zr either alone or in combination is deposited [page 3, lines 35-36].

The layer of the MCrAlY-coating further comprises (wt.-%) 0-2% Ta (= up to 5 wt%) [page 3, lines 35-36].

The layer of the MCrAlY-coating is deposited as overlay or bond coat under a layer of a ceramic coating (= thermal barrier coating) [page 3, lines 29-33].

A gas turbine article such as blades or vanes is coated (page 1, lines 3-5; and page 6, line 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

I. Claim **3** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **EP 848 077** ('077) as applied to claims 1-2, 6-7 and 13-14 above, and further in view of **Hecht et al.** (US Patent No. 4,758,480).

EP '077 is as applied above and incorporated herein.

The method of EP '077 differs from the instant invention because EP '077 does not disclose wherein the layer of the MCrAlY-coating has a γ/β-microstructure, as recited in claim 3.

Like EP '077, Hecht teaches depositing MCrAlY coatings. Hecht teaches that the microstructure of superalloys of commercial interest consists essentially of a gamma (nickel solid solution) matrix containing strengthening gamma prime precipitates (based on the phase Ni_3Al) [col. 2, lines 46-67]. The coating which will be found to provide highly useful protection for such a substrate will microstructurally consist of at least *90% by volume of the gamma and gamma prime phases* and contain *less than 10% by the volume of other phases such as the beta (NiAl) phase*. This substantial microstructural similarity between the substrate and the coating goes a long way toward rendering the mechanical properties of the coating similar to the mechanical properties of the substrate, thereby reducing thermomechanically induced damage during service. It is

preferred that the volume fraction of the gamma prime phase in the coating be similar to that of the substrate (col. 3, lines 9-26).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the MCrAlY coating described by EP '077 with wherein the layer of the MCrAlY-coating has a γ/β-microstructure because this would have reduced thermomechanically induced damage during service as taught by Hecht (col. 2, lines 46-67; and col. 3, lines 9-26).

II. Claim **4** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **EP 848 077** ('077) as applied to claims 1-2, 6-7 and 13-14 above, and further in view of **Elam et al.** (US Patent No. 3,528,861).

EP '077 is as applied above and incorporated herein.

The method of EP '077 differs from the instant invention because EP '077 does not disclose wherein the deposited coating is heat-treated in vacuum, argon, hydrogen at 1140 °C for 2 to 12 hours, as recited in claim 4.

Like EP '077, Elam teaches depositing MCrAlY coatings. Evans teaches a post-peening heat treatment involving heating to 1975°F ± 25° (= 1037.8°C) in dry argon, dry hydrogen or vacuum for 4 hours. Blades and vanes so processed exhibit a uniform coating having a thickness (col. 3, lines 18-26).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the MCrAlY coating described by EP '077 with wherein the deposited coating is heat-treated in vacuum, argon,

hydrogen at 1140 °C for 2 to 12 hours because this would have exhibited a uniform coating as taught by Elam (col. 3, lines 18-26).

III. Claim **5** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **EP 848 077** ('077) as applied to claims 1-2, 6-7 and 13-14 above, and further in view of **Czech et al.** (US Patent No. 5,401,307).

EP '077 is as applied above and incorporated herein.

The method of EP '077 differs from the instant invention because EP '077 does not disclose wherein the layer of the MCrAlY-coating further comprises (wt.-%) 0.01 to 3% Fe, as recited in claim 5.

Like EP '077, Czech teaches depositing MCrAlY coatings. Czech teaches that the nickel-based alloy essentially consists of *0 to 15%* of at least one of the elements of the group consisting of rhenium, platinum, palladium, zirconium, manganese, tungsten, titanium, molybdenum, niobium, *iron*, hafnium and tantalum (col. 2, lines 17-22). The selective inclusion of a particular element of the group of elements is based upon the knowledge that the element does not worsen the properties of the protective coatings but, instead, actually improves them, at least under certain circumstances (col. 2, lines 26-31; and col. 3, lines 13-19).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the MCrAlY coating described by EP '077 with wherein the layer of the MCrAlY-coating further comprises (wt.-%)

0.01 to 3% Fe because this element would have improved the properties of the protective coatings as taught by Czech (col. 2, lines 17-22; col. 2, lines 26-31; and col. 3, lines 13-19).

IV. Claims **8-12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **EP 848 077** ('077) as applied to claims 1-2, 6-7 and 13-14 above, and further in view of **WO 99/55527** ('527) and **Stamm** (US Patent No. 6,610,419) - which is the English equivalent of WO '527.

EP '077 is as applied above and incorporated herein.

The method of EP '077 differs from the instant invention because EP '077 does not disclose the following:

a. Wherein a layer of the MCrAlY-coating is deposited with a thickness control of ±20 μm of the thickness of the deposited layer, as recited in claim 8.

b. Wherein a layer of the MCrAlY-coating having a thickness in the range of 25-400 μm is deposited, as recited in claim 9.

c. Wherein a layer of the MCrAlY-coating having a thickness in the range of 25-300 μm is deposited, as recited in claim 10.

d. Wherein a layer of the MCrAlY-coating having a thickness in the range of 25-100 μm is deposited, as recited in claim 11.

e. Wherein a layer of the MCrAlY-coating having a thickness in the range of 25-50 μm is deposited, as recited in claim 12.

Like EP '077, Stamm teaches depositing MCrAlY coatings. Stamm teaches that an outer layer of MCrAlY coating on average *between 5 μm and 50 μm thick*. The total mean layer thickness of the protective layer is preferably between 100 μm and 200 μm (col. 4, lines 10-13). The outer layer is applied from a liquid phase, in particular by electrodeposition and has the composition of a γ-phase (col. 5, lines 23-30).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the thickness of the MCrAlY coating described by EP '077 with wherein a layer of the MCrAlY-coating is deposited with a thickness control of ±20 μm of the thickness of the deposited layer; wherein a layer of the MCrAlY-coating having a thickness in the range of 25-400 μm is deposited; wherein a layer of the MCrAlY-coating having a thickness in the range of 25-300 μm is deposited; wherein a layer of the MCrAlY-coating having a thickness in the range of 25-100 μm is deposited; and wherein a layer of the MCrAlY-coating having a thickness in the range of 25-50 μm is deposited because it is conventional in the art to have built-up the coating material to obtain the desired finished dimensions as taught by Stamm (col. 4, lines 10-13; and col. 5, lines 23-30).

Furthermore, Stamm teaches a 5 μm and 50 μm outer layer of electroplated MCrAlY in the γ-phase.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edna Wong whose telephone number is (571) 272-1349. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Edna Wong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1753

EW
February 1, 2006